

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 13-17 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103(a)) over Lagueux (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,669). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claim 1 recites a system in communication with a network comprising one or more storage devices and one or more hosts via a switching fabric, wherein application processes reside on the hosts, wherein the application processes configure and manage the hosts in which the application processes execute. The claims require: a manager in communication with the storage devices and hosts in the network and an interface process in communication with the manager, a switching fabric component, and the hosts, the interface process effecting execution of at least one process residing on the system including the manager, at least one application process residing on the switching fabric component, and at least one application process residing on at least one host.

Applicants amended claim 1 to write it from the perspective of a system in communication with a network, such that the network components are included in the preamble as environment. Applicants further added the requirement that the interface process effects execution of at least one process residing on a switching fabric component in the network. The additional requirement that the selected component for which application information is maintained can comprise a switching component is disclosed on at least page 175 of the Specification.

The Examiner cited col. 7, lines 20-31; col. 10, lines 21-28; col. 22, line 65 to col. 24, line 7 of Lagueux as teaching the pre-amended claim requirement of an interface process in communication with the manager and the hosts, the interface process effecting execution of at least one process residing on the system including the manager and at least one application process residing on one host. (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claim.

The cited col. 7 mentions a management interface 120 for managing an ISAN server 102A, which according to FIG. 1 is one system in a network. The management interface provides rules based management of the system, including scheduling, process orchestration, monitoring, etc.

The cited col. 7 does not teach the claim requirement of an interface process for effecting execution of a process on the system including the manager and at least one process residing on a

host in the network and effect execution of a process on a switching fabric component. Instead, the cited col. 7 discusses a management interface to manage one server in the network, not effect execution of application processes on other hosts and a switching fabric component in the network as claimed.

The cited col. 10 mentions a user interface for the ISAN server, including a display and input device. The display is coupled to HBC modules to support status displays, configuration display and management and other management functions. The HBC modules are host bridge controllers providing bridging paths. (Lagueux, col. 9, lines 46-50). Thus, the cited col. 10 concerns configuring host bridge controllers. Nowhere does the cited col. 10 teach or suggest an interface process for effecting execution of a process on the system including the manager, at least one process residing on a host in the network, and effect execution of a process on a switching fabric component. Instead, the cited col. 10 concerns a user interface for managing modules within the ISAN server itself because FIG. 3 shows the HBC components 202a, 202b as within the ISAN server 102a.

The cited col. 22 to col. 24 of Lagueux discusses a window for displaying information about a server and to manage a server. (col. 23, lines 1-15). The cited col. 23 further mentions management software showing a table having entries on hosts in the network. A host manager enables the user to assign a name and description to a port and define a LUN. (col. 23, lines 20-39). The cited col. 23 further discusses a dialog box to insert a host name and identifier, and to insert information about the network card, port number, etc. A user interface displays host information, and the user can change or delete a host name in the table, and enables the user to enter information on a host. (col. 23, line 47 to col. 24, line 7)

The cited cols. 22-24 discuss how a manager may view information on hosts and change the name of the hosts in the network as displayed in a table. Nowhere do the cited cols. 22-24 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of an interface process that effects execution of an application process on the system including the manager, at least one process application residing on a host in the network, and a application process on a switching fabric component. Nowhere is there any mention in the cited cols. 22-24 of effecting execution of application on hosts and switching components in the network as claimed.

The Examiner further cited col. 18, lines 43-49 of Nolan to address certain shortcomings of the cited Lagueux. The cited Nolan discusses a management interface on an ISAN server to

control and monitor at the ISAN server. As with the cited Lagueux, the cited Nolan also fails to teach or suggest the claim requirement of an interface process that effects execution of a process on the system including the manager, effects at least one application process residing on a host in the network, and effects an application process on a switching fabric component.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Pending claims 2 and 4-9 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1. Further, the below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amended claim 2 further requires a graphical output device coupled to the interface process for displaying one or more graphical objects each representing one of the application processes on the hosts and switching component and the interface process being coupled to the graphical output device for effecting the display of the graphical objects on the graphical output device.

Applicants amended claim 2 to clarify certain requirements and to add the requirement that graphical objects represents application processes on the switching component in addition to the hosts. Claim 2 includes the requirement of pre-amended claim 3 that the graphical objects represent an application process of a SAN component. The Examiner cited FIGs. 18 and 22 and col. 22, line 65 to col. 24, line 7 of Lagueux as teaching the pre-amendment form of claim 3. (Office Action, pg. 4)

As discussed, the cited cols. 22-24 discuss a display of host names and information on the hosts in a table. Nowhere does the cited Lagueux anywhere teach or suggest the display of graphical objects representing application processes residing in hosts and the switching component. Instead, the cited cols. 22-24 discuss the display of host names and other information, but not the claimed information on application processes executing therein.

Accordingly, claim 2 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 2 are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Amended claim 4 depends from claim 2 and further requires that the interface process responds to selection of one of the objects representing one application process by effecting execution of the application process represented by that object.

The Examiner cited col. 22, line 65 to col. 23, line 5 and FIG. 18 as teaching the additional requirement of claim 4. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited cols. 22-23 mentions an image for configuring a storage server and displaying information on the server. Nowhere do the cited cols. 22-24 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement that selection of an object executes an application process on a host or switching component in a network. Instead, the cited cols. 22-23 concerns managing a server, not execution of an application process of a component over a network.

Accordingly, claim 4 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirement of claim 2 is not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Amended claim 5 depends from claim 4 and further requires a store containing information regarding one or more hosts and the switching component and one or more application processes residing on selected hosts and the switching component.

Applicants amend claim 5 to add the requirement that the store contains information on an application process in the switching component. The additional requirement that the selected component for which application information is maintained can comprise a switching component is disclosed on at least page 175 of the Specification.

The Examiner cited col. 14, lines 58-67 and FIG. 11 of Lagueux as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5)

The cited col. 14 mentions that a cache includes processes that communicate with an interface, and that data structures in the cache include a local cache memory allocation, a cache table, and a drive interface. The driver interface connects with an HDM associated with a circuit. Nowhere does the cited col. 14 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement that a store contains information on application processes in hosts and a switching component in a network.

Accordingly, claim 5 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 2 are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Amended claim 6 recites that the interface process accesses the store, upon selection of one graphical object representing one host or the switching component to identify at least one application process residing on the host or switching component represented by the selected object.

Applicants amended claim 6 to add the requirement that the graphical object may represent a switching component. The additional requirement that the selected component for which application information is maintained can comprise a switching component is disclosed on at least page 175 of the Specification.

The Examiner cited col. 14, line 58 to col. 15, line 6 of Lagueux as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5)

The cited cols. 14-15 mention that a cache includes processes that communicate with an interface, and that data structures in the cache include a local cache memory allocation, a cache table, and a drive interface. The driver interface communicates with an HDM associated with a circuit. The cache can be in a high speed non-volatile memory. Nowhere do the cited cols. 14-15 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement that the interface process accesses the store, upon selection of one graphical object representing one host or the switching component to identify at least one application process residing on the host or switching component represented by the selected object.

Accordingly, claim 6 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirement of claim 6 is not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Applicants added new claims including requirements of claims 1, 2, and 4-9 in other formats, such as a network, method and program formats. Specifically, independent claims 21, 24, and 31 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Added claims 22, 23; 25-30, and 32-36 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of the independent claims 21, 24, and 31.

Moreover, claims 22, 25, and 32 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to 2; claims 23, 26, and 33 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 4; claims 27 and 34 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to 5; claims 28 and 36 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to 8; claims 29 and 35 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 6; and claim 30 is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 7.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 21-36 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the claim amendments. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: July 7, 2005

By: _____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984